

REMARKS

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1, 3-7, 9-11, 15 and 16 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 12 and 13 have been canceled by this amendment without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter recited therein.

I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. Claims 1, 3-5, 9, 15 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwoh et al. (US 6,115,057) in view of Corvin (US 2001/0054181) and Conkwright et al. (US 2002/0133490), and further in view of Leung et al. (US 2002/0095673).

Claim 1, as amended, recites the features of a function processing unit operable to activate and terminate a predetermined function based on a user's operation, the predetermined function being one of an e-mail function, a calling function, a JAVA application function, a web browser function, and a camera function; and a judging unit operable to judge that the broadcast contents should not be displayed when the predetermined function is activated, and to judge that the broadcast contents should be displayed when the predetermined function is terminated; wherein said function processing unit is further operable to cause, when the predetermined function has been activated, said display unit to display a function processing image instead of the broadcast contents while said outline presentation unit presents the outline, so that the presentation of the outline and the display of the function processing image are performed simultaneously, the function processing image being generated by the predetermined function and being different from the outline.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references do not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted combination of features recited in amended claim 1.

For example, with respect to Kwoh, Applicants note that this reference discloses a display device having parental control features, in which it is possible to block a video display, and replace the video display with textual data (see Abstract and col. 16, lines 15-19). In this regard, as explained in Kwoh, an authorized user of the system is able to enable/disable a blocking function which prevents certain broadcast contents from being displayed (see Figs. 8-11 and col. 9, lines 4-8).

Regarding the above-noted disclosure in Kwoh, Applicants note that in the Office Action, the Examiner has taken the position that the blocking function in Kwoh, which enables a user to prevent certain broadcast contents from being displayed, corresponds to the claimed “predetermined function” (e.g., see Office Action at page 4, lines 2-3, and page 5, lines 2-3).

In this regard, however, as noted above, claim 1 has been amended herein so as to recite that the predetermined function is one of an e-mail function, a calling function, a JAVA application function, a web browser function, and a camera function.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants note that while Kwoh discloses a parental control system, in which a user is able to block/allow certain broadcast contents from being displayed by enabling/disabling a blocking function, Applicants respectfully submit that Kwoh does not disclose or in any way suggest that the blocking/allowing of certain broadcast contents is based on the activation/termination of one of an e-mail function, a calling function, a JAVA application function, a web browser function, and a camera function.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Kwoh does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features recited in amended claim 1 of a function processing unit operable to activate and terminate a predetermined function based on a user’s operation, the predetermined function being one of an e-mail function, a calling function, a JAVA

application function, a web browser function, and a camera function; and a judging unit operable to judge that the broadcast contents should not be displayed when the predetermined function is activated, and to judge that the broadcast contents should be displayed when the predetermined function is terminated; wherein said function processing unit is further operable to cause, when the predetermined function has been activated, said display unit to display a function processing image instead of the broadcast contents while said outline presentation unit presents the outline, so that the presentation of the outline and the display of the function processing image are performed simultaneously, the function processing image being generated by the predetermined function and being different from the outline.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Corvin, Conkwright and Leung, even if considered in combination with Kwoh, do not render obvious the above-noted features recited in amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 3-5 and 9 depend from claim 1 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claims 15 and 16, Applicants note that each of these claims has been amended in a similar manner as claim 1 so as to recite the features of a function processing step of activating and terminating a predetermined function based on a user's operation, the predetermined function being one of an e-mail function, a calling function, a JAVA application function, a web browser function, and a camera function; and a judging step of judging that the broadcast contents should not be displayed when the predetermined function is activated, and judging that the broadcast contents should be displayed when the predetermined function is terminated, wherein in said function processing step, when the predetermined function has been

activated, the display unit is caused to display a function processing image instead of the broadcast contents while the outline is presented in said outline presentation step, so that the presentation of the outline and the display of the function processing image are performed simultaneously, the function processing image being generated by the predetermined function and being different from the outline.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Kwoh, Corvin, Conkwright and Leung does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features recited in amended claims 15 and 16. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 15 and 16 are patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

B. Claims 6 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwoh et al. (US 6,115,057) in view of Corvin (US 2001/0054181), Conkwright et al. (US 2002/0133490), and Leung et al. (US 2002/0095673), and further in view of Tsukagoshi (US 5,684,542).

Claim 6 depends from claim 1. Applicants submit that Tsukagoshi fails to cure the deficiencies of Kwoh, Corvin, Conkwright, and Leung, with respect to amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 6 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency. Regarding claim 13, as noted above, this claim has been canceled by this amendment.

C. Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwoh et al. (US 6,115,057) in view of Corvin (US 2001/0054181), Conkwright et al. (US

2002/0133490), and Leung et al. (US 2002/0095673), and further in view of Palmer (US 5,195,135).

Claim 7 depends from claim 1. Applicants submit that Palmer fails to cure the deficiencies of Kwoh, Corvin, Conkwright, and Leung, as discussed above, with respect to amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 7 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

D. Claims 10 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwoh et al. (US 6,115,057) in view of Corvin (US 2001/0054181), Conkwright et al. (US 2002/0133490), and Leung et al. (US 2002/0095673), and further in view of Lee et al. (US 2001/0049296).

Claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 1. Applicants submit that Lee fails to cure the deficiencies of Kwoh, Corvin, Conkwright, and Leung, as discussed above, with respect to amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 10 and 11 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

E. Claim 12 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwoh et al. (US 6,115,057) in view of Corvin (US 2001/0054181), and further in view of Conkwright et al. (US 2002/0133490).

Regarding claim 12, as noted above, this claim has been canceled by this amendment.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Kohei YAMAGUCHI et al.

*/Kenneth W. Fields/
By 2010.01.27 13:40:46 -05'00'*
Kenneth W. Fields
Registration No. 52,430
Attorney for Applicants

KWF/acs
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
January 27, 2010